

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/671,846	10/671,846 09/25/2003		Eugene George Olczak	133074-1	8697		
6147	7590	12/14/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
GENERA)	L ELECT	RIC COMPANY	CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN				
GLOBAL F PATENT D		CH RM. BLDG. K1-4A	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
NISKAYU			1772				
				DATE MAIL ED: 12/14/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)	7			
Office Action Summary		10/671,84	46	OLCZAK ET AL.				
		Examine	•	Art Unit				
		Alicia Che		1772				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	e cover sheet wit	h the correspondence addi	ress			
THE - External control	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO and time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by started parents of the maximum statutory. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no ever reply within the stat riod will apply and w atute, cause the app	ent, however, may a re utory minimum of thirty ill expire SIX (6) MONT lication to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. (HS from the mailing date of this com ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.			
Status								
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	3 November 2	<u>005</u> .					
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T	his action is n	on-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from co						
Applicat	ion Papers							
	The specification is objected to by the Exam							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		-	•				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	- · · ·	•	` ,	1 121(d)			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the							
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a least	ents have bee ents have bee riority docume eau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Ap ents have been r e 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National St	tage			
Attachmer	, ,		 -	(0.000)				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)			ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date			formal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)			

Application/Control Number: 10/671,846 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

Request for Continued Examination

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.53 (d) filed on November 23, 2005 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

- 2. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application, claims 14-28 have been cancelled.
- 3. Amendments to the claims, filed on October 25, 2005, 2005, have been entered in the above-identified application.

REJECTIONS

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McGrath (U.S. Patent No. 4,025,159).

Regarding Applicant's claim 1, McGrath discloses a multiplayer optical film (cellular retroreflective sheeting, title). The film comprises at least two component films (bass sheet and cover film, col. 3, lines 25-26). At least one of the component films (bass sheet) has an upper and lower surface (figure 3). The upper surface comprises a series of optical structures (mircospheres, col. 3, line 33) and a plurality of raised spacing structures (narrow intersecting

Art Unit: 1772

bonds, col. 3, line 26). The lower surface is essentially planar (figure 3). The component films are joined so as to constitute a single structure comprising at least one gap disposed between the component films (figure 3).

Furthermore, the gap is deemed to be greater than the coherent length of light used to illuminate the optical film since the reference discloses that same height for the spacing structures as claimed by Applicant. See the discussion below regarding claim 7. Furthermore, Applicant's specification on page 7, paragraph [0020] recites that the gap between surfaces should be greater than the coherent length of the light source, typically no less than a few microns.

The preamble/limitation "backlighting display" is deemed to be a statement with regard to the intended use and is not further limiting in so far as the structure of the product is concerned. In article claims, a claimed intended use must result in a *structural difference* between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. MPEP § 2111.02.

Regarding Applicant's claims 2 and 3, McGrath discloses that the optical structures are convex and concave structures (*mircospheres*, col. 3, line 33 and figure 3).

Regarding Applicant's claim 4, McGrath discloses that the optical structures are prisms, since the reference discloses cube-corner elements can be interchangeable used with the microspheres (col. 6, lines 13-20 and figure 7).

Regarding Applicant's claims 5 and 6, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures comprise at least one post-structure and/or at least one beam structure (narrow intersection bonds, col. 3, line 26 and figures 1, 3 and 7).

Page 4

Art Unit: 1772

Regarding Applicant's claim 7, McGrath discloses that the spacing structures have a height relative to the optical structures between about 0.1 and about 20 microns, since the reference shows in figure 3 that the spacing structure, i.e. narrow intersection bonds, have a height of half the diameter of the optical structures, i.e. microspheres, and the diameter of the microspheres is between 10 and 200 micrometers (*col. 5, lines 29-30*), which means that the height of the narrow intersection bonds is between 5 to 100 microns.

Regarding Applicant's claim 8, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures comprise at least one post-structure (narrow intersection bonds, col. 3, line 26 and figures 1, 3 and 7).

Regarding Applicant's claim 9, McGrath discloses that the component films have a thickness between about 0.006 and about 5 millimeters, since the reference discloses that the base sheet has a thickness of 75 micrometers (col. 6, lines60-61) and the cover film has a thickness between 1 and 5 mils (col. 5, line 14), which together have a thickness of 100.4-203 micrometers or 0.1 to 0.2 mm.

Regarding Applicant's claim 10, McGrath discloses that the gap comprises solid matter, fluid matter and combinations thereof, since the reference discloses that air, i.e. a fluid, in the gaps (col. 3, lines 23-30).

Regarding Applicant's claims 11 and 12, McGrath discloses that the raised spacing structures have either equal or unequal heights relative to the optical structures (figures 3 and 7).

Regarding Applicant's claim 13, figure 3 in McGrath shows that the raised spacing structures occupy an area, the area is deemed to define a percentage of a total area of the film

Art Unit: 1772

surface upon which the raised spacing structures are disposed. Furthermore, it can be seen from figure 1 that the percentage is in the range between about 1 and about 50.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments in the response filed October 25, 2005, 2005 regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 of record have been considered but are most due to the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Chevalier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1490. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12/12/05

ALICIA CHEVALIER